



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,891	07/23/2003	Dongmei Xu	07678/078003	2555
21559	7590	03/07/2006	EXAMINER	
CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110				CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1637		

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/626,891	XU ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Suryaprabha Chunduru	1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p> | <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|--|---|

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Restriction/election**

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-17, drawn to an enhancer cassette comprising enhancer derived from a cassava vein mosaic virus, expression construct, all requiring SEQ ID Nos. 1 positions 1-261, 1-332, 262-332, 333-444, classified in class 435, subclass 320.1, class 536, subclass 23.1.
  - II. Claim 18, drawn to a transgenic plant, classified in class 800, subclass 295 and class 435, subclass 419.
  - III. Claim(s) 19, drawn to a method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The enhancer cassette (Group I), the transgenic plant are all unrelated as they comprise distinct material and utilize different products (a nucleic acid vs a transgenic plant material) which demonstrate that each product has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using a structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for an enhancer cassette differ significantly for each of the materials. Therefore, each product is divergent in materials. For these reasons the Inventions I, and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, the distinct products require separate and distinct searches. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I and II together.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the nucleic acid product of Group I can be used in materially different method, such as DNA purification or polymerase chain reaction as opposed to its use as an enhancer cassette.

Searching the inventions of Groups I and III together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups I and III have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, and the enhancer cassette are not coextensive. Group III encompasses method steps for method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, which are not required for the search of Group I. In contrast, the search for Group I would require a text search for the use of the enhancer cassette in addition to a search for the enhancer cassette itself. Prior art, which teaches the enhancer cassette would not necessarily be applicable to the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule. Moreover, even if the product were known, the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the nucleic acid product of Group I can be used in materially different method, such as DNA purification or polymerase chain reaction as opposed to its use as an enhancer cassette.

Searching the inventions of Groups II and III together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups II and III have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, and the transgenic plant are not coextensive. Group III encompasses method steps for method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, which are not required for the search of Group II. In contrast, the search for Group I would require a text search for the use of the transgenic plant in addition to a search for the transgenic plant itself. Prior art, which teaches the transgenic plant would not necessarily be applicable to the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule. Moreover, even if the product were known, the method for expression of a nucleic acid molecule, may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

3. Additionally, Group I named above is subjected to further restriction. Applicants are required to elect one position of SEQ ID NO. 1 for examination. This requirement is made under 1192 O.G. 68 Notice (November 19, 1996 and revised M.P.E.P.), as the examination of more than one sequence in the application would result in an undue search burden on the PTO. Further, this is NOT an election of species. polynucleotide sequences representing different sequences constitute different structural features. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequences are presumed to represent an

independent and distinct invention, subject to restriction requirement pursuant to 35 USC 121 and 37 CFR 1.141. By statute, “[i]f two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions.” 35 U.S.C. 121. Pursuant to this statute, the rules provide that “[i]f two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the examiner in his action shall require the applicant... to elect that invention to which his claim shall be restricted.” 37 CFR 1.142 (a). See also 37 CFR 1.141(a).

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and the search for one group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully

Art Unit: 1637

examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.

See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suryaprabha Chunduru whose telephone number is 571-272-0783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30A.M. - 4.30P.M , Mon - Friday,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Suryaprabha Chunduru*  
SURYAPRABHA CHUNDURU  
PATENT EXAMINER  
*3/3/06*